UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/520,884	08/17/2005	Reinhard Milich	10191/3788	5065
²⁶⁶⁴⁶ KENYON & K	7590 09/25/200 ENYON LLP	EXAMINER		
ONE BROADV NEW YORK, N		BOMKAMP, ERIC A		
NEW TORK, I	N1 10004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	£.		2826	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
	•		09/25/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

uspto@kenyon.com

		TH.			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/520,884	MILICH ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Eric A. Bomkamp	2826			
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REWHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pe Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by st Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl n. eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH tatute, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	·				
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	0 January 2005.	·			
·— · · · —					
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	<u></u>				
closed in accordance with the practice und	ler <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	I1, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-44</u> is/are pending in the applic	ation				
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with					
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>23-44</u> is/are rejected.	•	domlibriton			
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.		Minhloan Tran			
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction ar	nd/or election requirement.	Primary Examiner			
Application Papers		Art Unit 2826			
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	•			
10) The drawing(s) filed on 1-10-2005 is/are: a	ı)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected t	o by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abeyance	e. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	,	•			
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	e Examiner. Note the attached (Office Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fore a) All b) Some * c) None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received.				
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	nents have been received in App	olication No			
3. Copies of the certified copies of the	· · · · ·	eceived in this National Stage			
application from the International Bu	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	ceived.			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) T Interview Sur	nmary (PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948	Paper No(s)/l	Mail Date			
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1-10-2005.	6) Other:	rmal Patent Application			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

Claim 25 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is suggested that line 3 be amended to "the stacked construction of the power MOS components includes...".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 23-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Azotea et al., US 6,060,795.
- 4. With respect to claim 23, Azotea shows a rectifier for rectifying an alternating current into a direct current, comprising: a control part including a controller component (64) and control terminals; a power circuit controlled by the control part and including switching elements; and

Application/Control Number: 10/520,884

Art Unit: 2826

all power-conducting components of the power circuit are power MOS components and are integrated in a stacked construction (Figs. 3 and 5, Column 4, lines 36-43).

Azotea discloses that the power device is a rectifier but fails to show a three-phase generator including a three-phase stator winding, wherein: phases of the stator winding are triggered via the switching elements.

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a three-phase generator in the system because the main purpose of a rectifier is to convert an AC signal from a three-phase generator to a DC signal.

- 5. With respect to claim 24, Azotea shows the power-conducting components are power MOS components that are contacted on both sides (Fig. 5, column 4, lines 36-43).
- 6. With respect to claim 25, Azotea shows a cooling device (203, 204), wherein: the stacked construction of the power semiconductor includes a first substrate and a second substrate (200), between which the power MOS (201, 202) components are placed via contacts on both sides (Fig. 9, column 8, lines 36-43).
- 7. With respect to claims 26 and 27, Azotea shows the cooling device is situated on top and on bottom of the stacked construction (Fig. 9).
- 8. With respect to claim 28, Azotea shows the power circuit is contacted outward over a surface (Fig 9).
- 9. With respect to claim 29, Azotea fails to show the power circuit is contacted outward via a heat conducting paste applied over a surface for dissipating heat.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a heat conducting paste for contact because it reduces the heat generated by the

device, which makes the device more reliable. One of the objects of the prior art is to effectively dissipate heat generated by the device, and a heat conducting paste is often used as an adhesive material in such applications and is well known in the art.

- 10. With respect to claim 30, Azotea shows that the MOS components are contacted on both sides via contact surfaces serving as soldering points/soldering surfaces in the stacked construction (Fig. 5 and 9).
- 11. With respect to claim 31, Azotea shows the power MOS components are contacted on both sides via contact surfaces serving as conductive adhesive surfaces in the stacked construction.
- 12. With respect to claim 32, Azotea shows a cooling element, wherein the stacked construction of the power circuit includes a pressed screen and a first substrate, between which the power MOS components, contacted on both sides, are placed (Azotea discloses screening as an option to mount the interface circuit pads and traces.
- 13. With respect to claim 33, Azotea fails to show the stacked construction of the power circuit includes an IMS substrate, to which the power MOS components are connected.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the power MOS components to a insulated metal substrate (IMS) because it achieves two obvious goals, preventing a short circuit between the substrate and the components, while also encouraging heat dissipation via the metal substrate.

14. With respect to claim 34, Azotea fails to show the control part is designed in a single-chip construction and includes a controller-ASIC component having an integrated driver component.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a controller having an ASIC component and an integrated driver component, because it would reduce the amount of area needed for the total device.

- 15. With respect to claim 35, Azotea shows the control part is designed in a multi-chip construction having a separate controller-ASIC component (32) and a separate driver component (30) (Fig. 1).
- 16. With respect to claim 36, Azotea shows the power circuit (10) contains power terminals (18) as contacts between the first substrate (14) and the second substrate (16) (Fig. 1, column 2, lines 35-47).
- 17. With respect to claim 37, Azotea shows the power circuit includes power terminals (18) that are placed on the first substrate (14) of the stacked construction (Fig. 1, column 2, lines 35-47).
- 18. With respect to claim 38, Azotea discloses a stacked construction power device, but fails to show an injection molded material in which the power MOS components are encapsulated.
- 19. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to encapsulate the power MOS components because it would protect the components from elements, such as moisture and dust.
- 20. With respect to claim 39, Azotea shows power terminals (200) of the power circuit (201, 202) extend outside on an exposed, coating-free surface of one of substrate surfaces of the stacked construction (Fig. 9, column 8, lines 36-43).
- With respect to claim 40, Azotea shows the power terminals (200) extend outside laterally from the power circuit (201, 202) (Fig. 9).

22. With respect to claim 41, Azotea fails to show the control part is situated on a surface, made from injection molded material, of the power circuit and is connected thereto via the control terminals extending outside in a vertical direction.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to situate the control part on a surface of the power circuit made from molded material because it would prevent a short circuit between the two components.

23. With respect to claim 42, Azotea fails to show that the control part includes an application-specific element.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an ASIC in the control part because ASICs are well known to aid specific functions in electrical systems.

- 24. With respect to claim 43, Azotea shows the stacked construction includes a base plate (14) having metallic fixing elements (99A, 99B) projecting from sides thereof (Fig. 5).
- 25. With respect to claim 44, wherein the control part (32) includes an IC having a wiring (26), having second control terminals and to which the control terminals of one of the first substrate and the second substrate are connected.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eric A. Bomkamp whose telephone number is 571-270-1559. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday 8:00AM-5:00PM E.S.T..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sue Purvis can be reached at 571-272-1236. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

EB 8-27-07